

## **REMARKS**

Claims 51-65 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, claims 51-52, 54-57, 59-62, and 64-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Flyntz (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,542). Claims 53, 58, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Flyntz in view of Angelo (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,882). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Flynt describes a smart card reader that grants or denies access to a restricted security subsystem based on identification information entered into the smart card reader by a computer user. See Flynt, col. 2, ll. 52-57. The smart card reader described by Flynt may include a microprocessor 32. See Flynt, col. 15, ll. 5-49. However, Flynt does not describe or suggest receiving a request for an authentication at a microcontroller included in a bridge, as set forth in independent claims 51, 56, and 61. Flynt also fails to describe or suggest that the request is received from a bus external to the bridge, as set forth in independent claims 51, 56, and 61.

Applicant therefore submits that the present invention is not anticipated by Flynt and request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 51-52, 54-57, 59-62, and 64-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not obvious in view of Flynt and Angelo, either alone or in combinatin. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). As discussed above, Flynt does not describe or suggest receiving a request for an authentication at a microcontroller included in a bridge, as set forth in independent claims 51, 56, and 61. Flynt also fails to describe or suggest that the request is received from a bus external to the bridge, as set forth in

independent claims 51, 56, and 61. Angelo discusses the system management mode. However, Angelo fails to remedy the fundamental deficiencies of the primary reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not obvious over the prior art of record and request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 53, 58, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2006

// Mark W. Sincell//

Mark W. Sincell, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 52,226

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON

10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100

Houston, Texas 77042

(713) 934-7000

(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)

AGENT FOR APPLICANT